

Date: Sat, 27 Aug 94 04:30:07 PDT  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #396  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Sat, 27 Aug 94                      Volume 94 : Issue    396

Today's Topics:

    100% NOTHING to do with CW...Repeaters and xfer of coordination  
                    CW ...IS NOW! (3 msgs)  
    Experimentation in the amateur service (was Re: CW VIEWS)  
    Telecommunicating (was Re: CW VIEWS) (2 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----

Date: Fri, 26 Aug 1994 04:53:33 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!  
europa.eng.gtefsd.com!news.umbc.edu!eff!news.kei.com!yeshua.marcam.com!  
insosf1.infonet.net!lindy2!lindberg@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: 100% NOTHING to do with CW...Repeaters and xfer of coordination  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Ken A. Nishimura writes:

> Repeater trustee/owner W1ABC decides that he wants out of the  
>repeater business. N1XYZ gets ownership of the physical repeater.

>Question:

>Should the coordinating body transfer the "coordination" to  
>N1XYZ with no questions asked, given the line of people waiting  
>for frequency assignments?

Here is an actual case:

A good friend of mine and I operated a 2-meter and 70cm repeater. Both were privately owned and operated by the two of us. Actually, my friend started the 2-meter repeater before I met him (1975) and the repeater was licensed under the old "WR9nnn" callsigns that the FCC used to issue to repeaters. Once those callsigns were phased out, both machines were placed under his callsign and coordinated as such (grandfathered in to the coordination process).

About 18 months ago, my friend died unexpectedly and had no surviving family members. We had a verbal agreement that should anything happen to him, I was to place my callsign on the repeaters and that they were to remain on the air.

Unfortunately, he did not make any provision in his will to direct his executor as to this agreement and I didn't personally know the executor nor did she know me. After some rather painful discussions, his executor agreed to allow the equipment to remain on the 450 foot tower on his property for the time being as a "living memorial."

Because of our friendship and the fact that the 2-meter repeater, particularly, is heavily used (it's part of a linked repeater system that covers a big chunk of eastern Iowa) I did my best to keep the repeaters on the air as soon as I was allowed access to the tower site to change the callsigns.

The repeater callsigns were changed to my call and I notified the frequency coordinator of the change. Since I had been listed as the contact person and had been sending in the coordination questionnaires for a couple of years (my friend sometimes forgot to send them in!) I didn't have any trouble getting the change made to the coordination.

Had I not been sending in the forms, however, I believe things may have been more complicated. Further, the repeaters will probably have to be moved eventually and this will require re-coordination.

Hope this helps.

<< Jeff -- K9JL >>

-----

Date: Fri, 26 Aug 1994 14:16:18 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!  
darwin.sura.net!rsg1.er.usgs.gov!stc06.CTD.ORN.L.GOV!xdepc.eng.ornl.gov!  
wyn@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: CW ...IS NOW!  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <199408261216.FAA07376@ucsd.edu>

William=E.=Newkirk%Pubs%GenAv.Mlb@ns14.cca.CR.rockwell.COM writes:

>> The latest popular experiment will be the two

>>engine jumbo jet service on transocean flights.

>>73,

>>C. C. (Clay) Wynn, N4AOX

>but you won't pay the ticket price for a 3 engine plane to be used. airlines  
>are eaten by fuel costs. the new aircraft operate with less fuel, therefore  
>less cost. very important when everyone wants transcontinental travel for \$40  
>a seat.

Don't they also save the price of one flight engineer or third man in the  
cockpit, as well as gas?

>and of course, Lindbergh made it on 1 engine...

>bill wb9ivr

Do you remember the tri-jet flight out of Miami which barely made it back when  
the crew managed to get No. 2 restarted, after all three had shut down with  
bearing overtemp due to loss of oil gallery seals? Just think of that  
sole third engine as Morse Code keyed CW. Nice to have when you need it.

73,

C. C. (Clay) Wynn, N4AOX

wyn@ornl.gov

=====  
= Cooperation requires participation. Competition teaches cooperation. =  
=====

-----

Date: 25 Aug 1994 16:27:57 GMT

From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!math.ohio-state.edu!usc!nic-nac.CSU.net!  
charnel.ecst.csuchico.edu!olivea!korie!male.EBay.Sun.COM!engnews1.Eng.Sun.COM!  
engnews2.Eng.Sun.COM!@@ihnp4.ucsd.edu

Subject: CW ...IS NOW!

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <wyn.153.2E5B7B46@ornl.gov> wyn@ornl.gov (C. C. (Clay) Wynn, N4AOX)  
writes:

>Maybe that is why you find some of the ship lines still advertising in the  
>back of QST for radio operators.

I just looked over a sample of recent QSTs (6 issues scattered over  
the last 3 years), and I didn't see any ads offering jobs for shipboard

radio operators. I saw a couple of ads \*looking\* for such jobs, which would seem to indicate that supply exceeds demand.

Rich

--

Rich McAllister (rfm@eng.sun.com)

-----

Date: 26 Aug 1994 17:59:15 GMT

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!news.cerf.net!hacgate2.hac.com!usenet@network.ucsd.edu

Subject: CW ...IS NOW!

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article 2E5DF932@ornl.gov, wyn@ornl.gov (C. C. (Clay) Wynn, N4AOX) writes:  
>Do you remember the tri-jet flight out of Miami which barely made it back when  
>the crew managed to get No. 2 restarted, after all three had shut down with  
>bearing overtemp due to loss of oil gallery seals? Just think of that  
>sole third engine as Morse Code keyed CW. Nice to have when you need it.

I can't believe this discussion has gotten so far off on this tangent,  
but to continue your somewhat far-fetched analogy:  
Should we require all airplanes to have three engines as the only acceptable  
way to meet a certain level of safety/redundancy?

-Brian

-----

Date: 25 Aug 1994 17:15:03 GMT

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!usc!nic-nac.CSU.net!

channel.ecst.csuchico.edu!olivea!korie1!newsworthy.West.Sun.COM!

abyss.West.Sun.COM!usenet@network.ucsd.edu

Subject: Experimentation in the amateur service (was Re: CW VIEWS)

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article 777831392@abercrombie.Stanford.EDU, paulf@abercrombie.Stanford.EDU  
(Paul Flaherty) writes:

>myers@bigboy.West.Sun.COM (Dana Myers ) writes:

>

>>Amateur radio is a service, but it isn't a service like the telephone  
>>company. Amateur radio is an experimental radio service, and Part 97.1  
>>lays down exactly what the US Amateur Radio Service is expected to do.

>

>What you've claimed here is that amateur radio is \*solely\* an experimental  
>radio service, which of course doesn't cut it. Experimentation is only one  
>of about a dozen or so pursuits within the hobby. You might not be happy  
>pursuing those aspects, but they do exist, and I daresay there are more of

>them than you.

I certainly do not intend to say that all amateur radio activities must be experimentation. However, all amateur radio activities are prone to the fact that amateur radio permits experimentation on a far broader scale than any other US radio service. I used the term "experimental" really to contrast amateur radio from professional radio.

I'd happily concede that "partly experimental" is more accurate.

Possibly it is fair to observe that being partly experimental is a little like being partly pregnant :-).

>If you're attempting non-hobby experimentation, then recourse to the  
>Experimental Service is strongly suggested.

My turn to pick a nit. I assume "non-hobby" means "commercial", i.e., experimentation you get paid for ?

---

\* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ, DoD#: j | Views expressed here are

\*

\* (310) 348-6043 | mine and do not necessarily \*

\* Dana.Myers@West.Sun.Com | reflect those of my employer

\*

\* "Sir, over there.... is that a man?"

\*

-----

Date: 26 Aug 1994 13:40:25 GMT

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!

newsrelay.iastate.edu!news.iastate.edu!wjturner@network.ucsd.edu

Subject: Telecommunicating (was Re: CW VIEWS)

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <33j1q7\$bdh\$1@mhade.inhouse.compuserve.com> Peter Coffee WA2OJL/AE  
<72631.113@CompuServe.COM> writes:

>How would people feel, philosophically, about retaining 5 wpm code as  
>a minimal requirement, but making higher speeds optional with the alternative  
>of demonstrating both proficiency and readiness to operate on another mode  
>in an emergency communications situation?

It's a start.

>Please, let's not have any more flames to the effect that "It's not about  
>how hard the test is, it's about whether the test has any right to exist."  
>Clearly, no one would bother objecting to a test that required, say,  
>identifying three out of ten randomly chosen letters that were sent with

>the testee deciding when (s)he was ready for the next letter in the series.  
>Right? Level of difficulty can not be dismissed out of hand as a non-issue.

Wrong. I would object. Not because of the difficulty of the test, but because morse code would still be singled out. If this test were somehow folded into the theory test, then I would say it might be all right.

>To say  
>that an emphasis on radio is out of date is like saying that an amateur  
>rocketry society should admit aficionados of radio-controlled aircraft  
>and high-altitude balloons and extension ladders: "The object is getting  
>things up in the air, right? Quit trying to live in the past!"

I think I understand now! Morse code is the only true radio. Everything else, even though it may use radio waves and transmitters and receivers that anyone other than a ham would call a radio, is clearly not radio. I wonder what they are then?

>And I'm sorry if anyone has felt personally put down by any of my messages  
>endorsing the continued use of a CW proficiency test. That's not how it's  
>meant at all.

I'm sorry if you feel personally put down by any of the messages endorsing the elimination of a \*Morse Code\* proficiency test. That's not how it's meant at all.

-----

Date: 26 Aug 1994 15:08:59 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!news.cerf.net!hacgate2.hac.com!usenet@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Telecommunicating (was Re: CW VIEWS)  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article 2E5DD6D0@ornl.gov, wyn@ornl.gov (C. C. (Clay) Wynn, N4AOX) writes:  
>In article <082594172423Rnf0.78@amcomp.com> dan@amcomp.com (Dan Pickersgill)  
writes:

>>

>>Hopefully, sooner or later, you will realize that you have misunderstood  
>>Part 97 and then we can continue.

>

>On the contrary, I think I have succeeded in demonstrating that you do  
>not understand Part 97, or as the case may be just don't want to admit  
>your misinterpretation, so we cannot continue.

Well, at least you included the words "I think" this time. In \*my\* opinion, you have demonstrated no such thing. And like many of your other arguments, repetition does not make them any more valid.

In another post, Clay writes:

>I am tired of having to rehash the proofs to late check-ins. If you  
>want the proof read the back issues.

Again, your opinions do not constitute proofs.

> Read FCC PR 94-59, then research  
>the details of how it will be implemented. Then read Senie over on  
>r.r.a.p. to see if packet makes sense on HF. Some have attempted to  
>use vilification to divert attention from the real issues. I do not,  
>oops.... IMHO I do not fault those who use point-to-point digital modes,  
>G-TOR, CLOVER, AMTOR, PACTOR, Baudot, ASCII, etc. on HF when operating  
>courtesy is used. IMHO the attempt to hard code 132 KHz of frequencies  
>for packet networks and even more for BBS's in the HF subbands, particularly  
>in the Novice portions, is abhorrent not just to me but to many, many,  
>others and, at least in spirit, violates much of Part 97.1.

Not that I agree or disagree with the proposed allocation, but why do  
you feel this violates part 97.1? Do you also feel that having other  
modes with specific spectrum allocations (e.g. CW) violates 97.1?

And why would you not want novices to have access to these networks  
and BBS's?

-Brian

-----

Date: Fri, 26 Aug 1994 14:10:12 GMT

From: walter!dancer.cc.bellcore.com!not-for-mail@uunet.uu.net

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <wyn.162.2E5CE1D5@ornl.gov>, <33j2tf\$i2f@dancer.cc.bellcore.com>,  
<wyn.164.2E5DD648@ornl.gov>

Subject : Re: CW VIEWS

In article <wyn.164.2E5DD648@ornl.gov>,

C. C. (Clay) Wynn, N4AOX <wyn@ornl.gov> wrote:

>In article <33j2tf\$i2f@dancer.cc.bellcore.com>

>whs70@dancer.cc.bellcore.com

>(sohl,william h) writes:

>

>>Maybe you should check who participates in this newsgroup (I've been

>>a reader/contributer since the policy group was created) before

>>assuming anyone that asks you to identify fact from opinion is

>>labeled as a "late check-in."

>

>Sorry I didn't identify you earlier as one of the "net-legends" who

>were around since creation. Please let me pay proper homage now and  
>accept my apology.

First you label me a "late check-in" and now, because I identify  
my long term involvement with the newsgroup, you label me in  
a sarcastic manner (IMHO) as a "net-legend." Seems to me (IMHO)  
you rely on labeling people more than the validity of any arguments  
you can raise to discredit other people's comments.

>>> If you  
>>>want the proof read the back issues. Read FCC PR 94-59, then research  
>>>the details of how it will be implemented. Then read Senie over on  
>>>r.r.a.p. to see if packet makes sense on HF.

>  
>>I've read the posts as they appeared. FCC PR 94-59 does not ask to  
>>"wipe-out" CW usage on HF. As to Mr. Senie's comments on packet on  
>>HF, I don't know, but his arguments (pro or con) are simply that...  
>>arguments, not fact.

>  
>Is that your opinion or is that a fact? Please make your opinions  
>separate and identifiable from fact. Or are "net legends" exempt.

Conventional net ettiquette is to clearly label one's opinion.  
For you, I'll state that it is indeed fact that nothing in  
past postings by anyone opposed to continued CW testing requirements  
included any comments supporting elimination of CW usage on HF.

Nor does FCC PR 94-59 ask to "wipe-out" CW usage on HF.

As to Mr. Senie's posts, I claim that from a factual standpoint,  
the gist of Mr. Senie's posts constitute arguments (or opinion)  
and not purely fact.

Standard Disclaimer- Any opinions, etc. are mine and NOT my employer's.

-----  
Bill Sohl (K2UNK) BELLCORE (Bell Communications Research, Inc.)  
Morristown, NJ email via UUCP bcr!cc!whs70  
201-829-2879 Weekdays email via Internet whs70@cc.bellcore.com  
-----

Date: Thu, 25 Aug 1994 18:24:21 GMT  
From: news.cerf.net!nntp-server.caltech.edu!netline-fddi.jpl.nasa.gov!  
elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!swrinde!gatech!newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!jobone!ukma!  
rsg1.er.usgs.gov!stc06.CTD.ORN.L.GOV!@ihnp4.ucsd.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <33g310\$8kq@abyss.West.Sun.COM>, <wyn.155.2E5C8DB6@ornl.gov>,



<33iffp\$pnj@dancer.cc.bellcore.com>  
Subject : Re: CW VIEWS

In article <33iffp\$pnj@dancer.cc.bellcore.com> whs70@dancer.cc.bellcore.com  
(sohl,william h) writes:

>Ditto my comments above. Please provide specific references to your  
>"claim" that anyone has indicated a desire to "wipe-out" CW usage  
>on HF (or anywhere else for that matter).

>If your claim is just your opinion, please state it as such.

I am tired of having to rehash the proofs to late check-ins. If you  
want the proof read the back issues. Read FCC PR 94-59, then research  
the details of how it will be implemented. Then read Senie over on  
r.r.a.p. to see if packet makes sense on HF. Some have attempted to  
use vilification to divert attention from the real issues. I do not,  
oops.... IMHO I do not fault those who use point-to-point digital modes,  
G-TOR, CLOVER, AMTOR, PACTOR, Baudot, ASCII, etc. on HF when operating  
courtesy is used. IMHO the attempt to hard code 132 KHz of frequencies  
for packet networks and even more for BBS's in the HF subbands, particularly  
in the Novice portions, is abhorrent not just to me but to many, many,  
others and, at least in spirit, violates much of Part 97.1.

When certain company extends me the courtesy of attaching IMHO to their  
babbling, then I will preface my truthful expositions and original thoughts  
with the same. My apologies if you have felt overwhelmed or threatened by  
my opinions.

73,  
C. C. (Clay) Wynn, N4AOX  
wyn@ornl.gov

=====  
= ...- .. ...- .- - . .-.. . --. .- .-.. .... -.- =  
=====

-----

Date: Fri, 26 Aug 1994 15:55:55 GMT  
From: news.cerf.net!nntp-server.caltech.edu!netline-fddi.jpl.nasa.gov!  
elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!ncar!gatech!howland.reston.ans.net!darwin.sura.net!  
rsg1.er.usgs.gov!stc06.CTD.ORNL.GOV!@ihnp4.ucsd.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <33j2tf\$i2f@dancer.cc.bellcore.com>, <wyn.164.2E5DD648@ornl.gov>,  
<33kt44\$pa1@dancer.cc.bellcore.com>g1.er.

Subject : Re: CW VIEWS

In article <33kt44\$pa1@dancer.cc.bellcore.com> whs70@dancer.cc.bellcore.com (sohl,william h) writes:

>Conventional net ettiquette is to clearly label one's opinion.  
>For you, I'll state that it is indeed fact that nothing in  
>past postings by anyone opposed to continued CW testing requirements  
>included any comments supporting elimination of CW usage on HF.

>Nor does FCC PR 94-59 ask to "wipe-out" CW usage on HF.

Well Mr. Sohl, why don't you ask those who have been, are, and will be QRM'd by the implementation of this PR? Maybe the facts are that you are misinformed? Have you ever operated on HF CW? Can you present a QSL card confirming your last QSO on HF, just to keep it factual of course? Regardless, I wanted to included the following in response to some of the E-Mail I have received. I hope you don't mind or it does not violate your interpretation of "net ettiquette".

\*\*\*\*\* cut here \*\*\*\*\*  
Reference: Notice of Proposed Rule Making (NPRM) in PR Docket 94-59 released June 23, with a comment deadline of October 1, 1994.  
"Automatic Control of Stations Transmitting a Digital Emission on the High Frequency (HF) amateur service bands."

First, don't bother petitioning the ARRL to advocate withdrawal of the NPRM. They (the Board of Directors and Officers) in the name of the ARRL, along with American Digital Radio Society Inc. submitted the original petition that led to the NPRM.

Borrowing a page from teh K1ZZ political action manual: as a minimum just write and let the FCC know that you do not support the ARRL and ADRS position on PR Docket 94-59. Send an original and four copies of your comments to the Secretary, FCC, Washington DC, 20554. At the top put "In the matter of PR Docket 94-59". Make sure your comments arrive before October 1, and as a courtesy you may want to send a copy of your comments to the ARRL.

\*\*\*\*\*cut here\*\*\*\*\*

73,  
C. C. (Clay) Wynn, N4AOX  
wyn@ornl.gov

=====  
= Cooperation requires participation. Competition teaches cooperation. =  
=====

-----  
End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #396

\*\*\*\*\*